



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/523,706	07/31/2008	Albert K. Tai	EX03-059C-US	9877
63572 7590 01/21/2010 MCDONNELL BOEHNNEN HULBERT @ BERGHOFF LLP 300 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE SUITE 3100 CHICAGO, IL 60606				
EXAMINER GODDARD, LAURA B				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1642				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/21/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/523,706

Applicant(s)

TAI ET AL.

Examiner

LAURA B. GODDARD

Art Unit

1642

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 February 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I claim(s) 1-12, 16-19, drawn to the special technical feature of a method of **identifying a candidate RB pathway modulating agent**, said method comprising the steps of: (a) providing an assay system comprising a PSMC polypeptide or nucleic acid; (b) contacting the assay system with a test agent under conditions whereby, but for the presence of the test agent, the system provides a reference activity; and (c) detecting a test agent-biased activity of the assay system, wherein a difference between the test agent-biased activity and the reference activity identifies the test agent as a candidate RB pathway modulating agent.

Group II, claim(s) 13-15 and 20-22 drawn to the special technical feature of a method for **modulating a RB pathway of a cell** comprising contacting a cell defective in RB function with a candidate modulator that specifically **binds to a PSMC polypeptide**, whereby RB function is restored; a method of modulating RB pathway in a mammalian cell comprising contacting the cell with an agent that specifically **binds a PSMC polypeptide**.

Group III, claim(s) 20-22, drawn to the special technical feature of a method of **modulating RB pathway in a mammalian cell** comprising contacting the cell with an agent that specifically **binds a PSMC nucleic acid**.

Group IV, claim(s) 23-25, drawn to the special technical feature of a method for **diagnosing a disease in a patient** comprising:

- (a) obtaining a biological sample from the patient;
- (b) contacting the sample with a probe for PSMC expression;
- (c) comparing results from step (b) with a control;
- (d) determining whether step (c) indicates a likelihood of disease.

The inventions listed as Groups I-IV do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The technical feature linking Groups I-IV appears to be a PSMC polypeptide.

However, said technical feature does not constitute a special technical feature in view of Park et al (PNAS, 1999, 96:6434-6438). Park et al teach a PSMC polypeptide, Tat-binding protein 1 (TBP1). As evidenced by iHOP, "PSMC3," TBP1 is another name for PSMC3 (26S subunit, ATPase, 3).

Therefore, the technical feature linking the inventions of Groups I-IV does not constitute a special technical feature as defined by PCT Rule 13.2 as it does not define a contribution over the prior art. Accordingly, Groups I-IV are not so linked by the same

or a corresponding special technical feature as to form a single general inventive concept and restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

SPECIES ELECTIONS

Species Election for Group I

A. This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species of assay system are as follows (claim 1):

- (a) assay system comprising a PSMC polypeptide, or**
- (b) assay system comprising a PSMC polynucleotide.**

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: Each assay system requires a structurally distinct molecule.

B. This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species of assay are as follows:

- (a) screening assay (claim 4),**
- (b) ATPase assay (claim 5),**
- (c) apoptosis assay (claim 6),**
- (d) cell proliferation assay (claim 6),**
- (e) angiogenesis assay (claim 6),**
- (f) hypoxic induction assay (claim 6),**
- (g) binding assay (claim 7), or**
- (h) expression assay (claim 8-10).**

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: Each assay is functionally distinct requiring different method steps, reagents, variables, and criteria for success.

C. This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species of methods steps are as follows:

- (a) further comprising step (d) (claim 11),**
- (b) further comprising steps (e)-(g) (claim 16), or**
- (c) not further comprising steps (d) or (e)-(g).**

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: Each method requires different steps, reagents, variables and criteria for success.

If Applicants choose the species of “(a) further comprising step (d) (claim 11)” or “(b) further comprising steps (e)-(g) (claim 16)” in C above, Applicants must elect a species in D below:

D. This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species of system for the second assay system are as follows:

(a) cultured cells (claim 17), or

(b) non-human animal (claims 12, 18, 19).

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: Each assay system requires a physiologically distinct population of cells and model system.

Species Election for Group II

E. This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species of cell system are as follows:

(a) cultured cells, or

(b) animal (claim 14, 21).

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: Each assay system requires a physiologically distinct population of cells and model system.

F. This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species of modulator are as follows:

(a) antibody (claim 15, 22),

(b) small molecule (claim 15, 22),

(c) nucleic acid modulator (claim 22).

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding

special technical features for the following reasons: Each modulator is structurally and functionally distinct.

Species Election for Group III

G. This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species of cell system are as follows:

- (a) cultured cells, or**
- (b) animal (claim 21).**

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: Each assay system requires a physiologically distinct population of cells and model system.

H. This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species of modulator are as follows:

- (a) antibody (claim 22),**
- (b) small molecule (claim 22),**
- (c) nucleic acid modulator (claim 22).**

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: Each modulator is structurally and functionally distinct.

Species Election for Group IV

I. This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species of PSMC expression measured are as follows (claim 23):

(a) protein expression, or

(b) nucleic acid expression.

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: Each expression requires distinct reagents or probes for measurement, requires different methods steps, variables, and criteria for success.

J. This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species of cancer are as follows (claim 25): **Elect a cancer from Table 1.**

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: Each cancer is physiologically and etiologically distinct.

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does

not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LAURA B. GODDARD whose telephone number is (571)272-8788. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00am-3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Larry Helms can be reached on 571-272-0832. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Laura B Goddard/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1642